

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/752,082		12/29/2000	Eric C. Anderson	P212/1976P 4003	
29141	7590	01/27/2005	•	EXAMINER	
SAWYER P O BOX 5		ROUP LLP	COFFY, EMMANUEL		
	O ALTO, CA 94303			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2157	

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application N .	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/752,082	ANDERSON, ERIC	C.
, . , ,	Examiner	Art Unit	7
·	Emmanuel Coffy	2157	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the c ver sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 10 December 2004 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated a simely filed amendment which	ition. A proper reply places the applica	y to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the content o	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI f extension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriginally set in the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	s.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	. , ,		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consideration Sheet.	dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-37</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen 10. Other:	ARIO SUPERVISORY I	ETIENNE PATENT EXAMINER Y CENTER 2100	
	"OUNTOLUO	I VEITIEN 2100	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant offers no new convincing arguments in the response after final. These arguments are generally the same as previously addressed by applicant, and they were rebutted in the Final Office action. The assertions made by applicant do not to overcome the teachings of the prior art as cited in the Final Rejection.